

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-15, 17-29, 31-33, 35 and 36 are amended for the purposes of clarity and antecedent basis. No new matter is added.

The Office Action objects to the specification at p. 6, line 27. The specification is amended to obviate this objection. Withdrawal of this rejection to the specification is respectfully solicited.

The Office Action objects to claim 18 regarding the feature "a situation registration section." Applicants respectfully submit that the corresponding feature is disclosed in Fig. 16 and on p. 23, line 8 - p. 24, line 13 of the specification, for example. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 18 is respectfully solicited.

The Office Action objects to the drawings regarding the feature "situation detection device" recited in claim 1, 4, 9, 19 and 22. Applicants respectfully submit that the situation detection device is disclosed as a "base station control device" at least in Figs. 2 and 4, for example. Withdrawal of this objection to the drawings is respectfully solicited.

The Office Action objects to the drawings regarding the features "mobile unit detection section" and "presence judgment section" recited in claim 4. Applicants respectfully submit that these features are disclosed at least in Figs. 2, 6A-C and 7, for example. Withdrawal of this objection to the drawings is respectfully solicited.

The Office Action objects to the drawings regarding the feature "destination status acquisition section" recited in claim 12. Applicants respectfully submit that this feature is disclosed at least in Fig. 18 and the accompanying discussion in p. 28, line 6 - p. 29, line 1, for example. Withdrawal of this objection to the drawings is respectfully solicited.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Cao (U.S. 6,529,136) in view of Papadiaz (U.S. 6,907,252). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

On p. 6, The Office Action admits that Cao does not disclose or suggest that the situation detection device is disposed in the dialogue place, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 9, 19 and 27. Nonetheless, the Office Action asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention (OOSIATI) would have been motivated to use the mobile terminal detection apparatus in Papadiaz with the system in Cao. However, Applicants respectfully submit that OOSIATI would not have been motivated to use the mobile terminal detection apparatus in Papadiaz with the system in Cao because the combination would be inoperable.

Cao discloses a group notification system and method which indicates the proximity of individuals or groups to other individuals or groups. See Abstract and col. 4, lines 9-14. The system in Cao operates by obtaining a GPS or other location of one or more individuals and then calculating whether each is sufficiently far from another individual or individuals or a reference location. See col. 6, lines 41-56; col. 7, lines 1-27; claim 1 and Figs. 2, 5 and 6. Thus, Cao requires that the mobile terminals report a current location for their respective users. See col. 5, lines 50-52 ("The GPS receiver interface 22 determines a current location of the user wireless module 222 and supplies its current location to the session manager 241.").

Papadiaz discloses a system for detecting and identifying cell phones near a detector. See Abstract and col. 2, lines 52-67. Papadiaz does not disclose or suggesting identifying and transmitting a location of the cell phone. Rather, the system in Papadiaz assumes its own location and reports whether any cell phone is located near that location when the situation monitoring section judges that the detected situation conforms to the dialogue condition. See

col. 6, lines 12-24. Thus, OOSIATI would not have been motivated to use the mobile terminal detection apparatus in Papadias with the system in Cao because doing so would render the system in Cao inoperable. For example, the system in Cao would no longer be able to track the location of one or more users and thereby calculate whether a distance between two users or between a user and a reference point surpasses a threshold.

Accordingly, Papadias and Cao cannot properly be combined to disclose or suggest that the situation detection device is disposed in the dialogue place, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 9, 19 and 27. Thus, Papadias and Caos cannot properly be combined to disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1, 9, 19 and 27.

In view of the above, Papadias and Caos cannot properly be combined to disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1, 9, 19 and 27. Claims 2-8 ultimately depend from claim 1; claims 10-18 ultimately depend from claim 9; claims 20-26 ultimately depend from claim 19; and claims 28-36 ultimately depend from claim 27. Thus, Papadias and Caos cannot properly be combined to disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1-36. Withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully solicited.


In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-36 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-36 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kipman T. Werking
Registration No. 60,187

JAO:KTW/eks

Date: March 10, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--